



Acts 2: The Divine Empowerment of Leaders

Thomas J. Norbutus
Regent University

This paper is an intertextual analysis of Acts 2 that explores sources such as the New Testament, early Christian writings, Jewish apocryphal, and psuedopedigraphical texts. It identifies examples of divine leadership as explained through trust, interrelationships, and empowerment (de Silva, 2004). Further, the study of intertexture differentiates the enduring, eternal character of the divine message of salvation in Acts from an inspiring secular message which may be received, processed, and even fondly remembered and passed on as history. The latter lacks the living fire of the message of eternal salvation. Personal power or the power of personality/charisma/etc. comes as close to Jesus' power of personality as mortals can get (Bass, 1998).

Acts 2 is an important account of the Christian community where God, through the Holy Spirit, empowered the church to carry out the Great Commission. This empowerment was immediate and effective as Peter, who had previously denied Jesus three times, preached to his followers a message from God that resulted in the salvation of 3,000 people. The use of intertextual analysis to study this text is undertaken in order to more thoroughly understand it, specifically in the area of leadership.

With the current research in leadership moving from a systems-based approach of theorists such as Burns (1978), Bass (1990), Hickman (1998), Northouse (2004), and Yukl (2002) to a call for a process-based approach (Yukl, 2006) and subsequent delivery of such an approach (Stacey, 2001, 2003, 2007), the biblical passage of Acts 2 (Buzzell, Boa, & Perkins, 1998) can be explored through a variety of lenses. This article reveals elements of the divine empowerment of leaders in scripture that allows a greater understanding by including a process perspective as articulated in Stacey's (2001) complex responsive processes of relating. Specifically, the convergence of theology and divine empowerment, as understood from a critical analysis of the intertexture of Acts 2, are linked to social and cultural applications of servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), theories X and Y (McGregor, 1969, as cited in Burton & Obel, 2004), situational leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; Manchester, 1983; Middleton, 2006),

transactional (Burns, 1978), transformational (Bass, 1990; Burns, 2003), and complex responsive processes of relating (Stacey, 2001, 2003, 2007) leadership theories.

Robbins (1996) integrated linguistic, social, and cultural studies as a programmed methodology to enlarge the social dimension of the text and as a way to explore textual interpretation in areas such as leadership (Bekker, 2006). Robbins wrote:

The interweaving of multiple textures and discourses within a text creates an environment in which signification, meanings and meaning effects interact with one another in ways that no one method can display. Only an approach that is highly programmatic, complexly variegated and readily adaptable can begin to engage and exhibit the rich world that texts bring into the life of humans as they live, work, struggle, suffer, die, celebrate and commemorate together. (as cited in Bekker, p. 9)

The exploration of other significant works provides insights to the social, psychological, political, and humanistic events of the time period.

Foundations of Intertexture Analysis

Poon (2006) posited, “The use of socio-rhetorical criticism, a multi-dimensional approach to textual analysis introduced by Robbins (1996), allows us to use multiple layers or textures to interpret the text” (p. 49). While Robbins’ approach involves several perspectives in which to explore the various textures, this article utilizes the perspective of *intertexture*. Intertexture is when “authors frequently weave the words of older, existing texts (whether those texts are written or passed on orally, ancient or contemporary) into the new texts they create” (de Silva, 2004, p. 800). Authors have utilized previous texts and have created new text without indication that ideas from the other text are being brought in with varying degrees of exactness. Understanding the original text is important because it reveals how the author utilizes and changes the original meaning. Robbins (1996) posited that the term *intertextuality* emphasizes that texts are mosaics of quotations where the literary word is an intersection of textual surfaces as a “dialogue among several writings” (p. 143). This view is especially prevalent in the New Testament study where Jewish tradition in a Mediterranean mode was carried through the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses. Robbins wrote, “The issue is the social and cultural texture of the texts, and the reader must learn to distinguish between analysis and interpretation of social and cultural intertexture” (p. 143).

Intertexture, in social-rhetorical terminology, interprets the text as a work between the author and the text, not between the text and the reader (Robbins, 1996). The words themselves are in relation to other words in the text, so in reality the text itself lies in relation to other texts. This intertexture covers the spectrum that includes: “(1) oral-scribal intertexture, (2) historical intertexture, (3) social intertexture, and (4) cultural intertexture” (p. 96). It is debatable that texts have infinite relations to other texts in the world; however, intertextual analysis establishes boundaries which interpreters can establish or “accept implicit or explicit canons of literature within which they work” (p. 97).

Here the focus is on oral-scribal analysis of intertexture which includes the recitation, recontextualization, and reconfiguration of other texts (Robbins, 1996). Robbins provided insight into the social, cultural, and historical interpretations of earlier texts and allowed the modern author to summarize epistemological views into a new text. In Act 2, the leadership principle of divine empowerment is explored to show how “God works through ordinary people to

accomplish his work in the world” (Buzzell et al., 1998, p. 1275). This text also provides insight into those individuals who open themselves up to the Holy Spirit and offer their lives as leaders with a new purpose. This interaction among people is the foundation of leadership and the basis of Stacey’s (2007) complex responsive processes of relating theory. In understanding organizations as complex responsive processes, Stacey wrote:

An individual mind is a silent, private conversation resonating with vocal, public conversations. Mind and group/society are the same phenomenon. They form and are formed by each other, at the same time, in an essentially referential process. That process is also reflexive in that people evoke, provoke, and resonate with each other in ways that are both enabled and constrained by their own histories of relating. (p. 359)

In Acts, Stephen was a Greek convert “chosen to assist the early church in serving the Greek speaking widows” (Buzzell et al., 1998, p. 1275). Although Stephen was a layman, he shared his beliefs and values with those who would listen and stood by his convictions to the point of death. Philip never lost his passion for delivering his message of hope, having enthusiasm for a new convert, and sharing his faith at every opportunity. His decisive, engaging, and proactive approach stands as a model for leaders in communicating both vision and values. Leadership comes from many different situations such as when Paul stopped the Philippian jailer from committing suicide and then invited him to accept a new life in Jesus Christ. These examples of leadership empowerment are the backdrop of how leaders encourage a sense of empowerment in ordinary individuals to support a cause greater than themselves. In this case, it was to live in the Word of Christ the Lord.

Leadership passages in Acts show that ordinary people have the ability to change themselves and others around them (Buzzell et al., 1998). In Acts 1:8, Christ called and empowered individuals to do his work in the world. In Acts 6:2-4, leaders find that instead of doing it all by themselves, they recognize their own strengths and offer to develop those strengths in others. In Acts 18:24-26, Priscilla and Aquila, after hearing a great, but misguided speaker, invited him into their home and gently explained the truth about Jesus Christ. These passages show that leadership is an integral and important part of the Bible. Exploring the texture provides a window into the historical, cultural, and social backdrop of Christ’s vision and leadership. The benefit of studying Acts is to provide a historical narrative underpinning most of the New Testament letters through which the exciting story of the birth and expansion of the early church is developed. The text of Acts is part of passing on the good news of Jesus Christ until he returns.

Acts

The author of Acts is Luke and the story takes place between A.D. 30-60 in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, and the Roman Empire (Buzzell et al., 1998). Acts 1-7 take place from A.D. 33-35 in Jerusalem covering topics of establishment, triumph, Jews, and Peter. Acts 8-12 take place from A.D. 35-48 in Judea and Samaria where the focus of the Gospel is on extension, transition, Samaritans, and Philip. The final part of Acts covers a period of 14 years from A.D. 48-62 in the Roman Empire and focuses on efforts to spread the good news to the ends of the earth. In Acts 13-21:26, Luke highlights expansion, travels, Gentiles, and Paul, where Acts 21:27-28 focuses on explanation, trials of the Gentiles, and Paul.

In order to understand the second chapter of Acts, one must be able to look at the entire book because it puts this chapter in context. In Acts 1-8, Jesus empowers his disciples to reach the world with his message. To enable this, he gave them the power to succeed (Buzzell et al., 1998). However, Jesus did not promise his disciples authority or influence, rather, he promised them the power of the truth, which was the only resource they really needed to succeed. In reality, leaders can't confer power to their followers without creating the conditions that allow people to develop the insights they need to do their job. Leaders often "think in terms of enablement and freedom in order to empower their followers" (p. 1277). Empowerment just does not happen. Situations emerge that allow followers to be successful by applying their insights. Jesus spent 3 years educating his disciples so they could utilize the knowledge resources that he had provided to them. If Jesus had sent them out too early the disciples would have been doomed to failure. However, Jesus nurtured them for their mission of enlightenment. Leaders can empower their followers through proper preparation. Since Christianity is not a set of regulations and instructions, the key to success is the formation of a life-giving relationship with the Lord. This relationship is not a matter of someone telling others how to live, but it is God empowering us to be the best we can be as we become more familiar with his desires for us through scripture and prayer. Romans 8:1-39 provides insight into the rich resources we have received "through the Spirit of God" (p. 1328). Titus 2:15 is a great example of how a man can be personally equipped to empower others. Also Acts 1-8 shows how Jesus empowered his disciples through "communication of His vision" (p. 1276). Matthew 28:18-20 highlights further principles of empowerment. Bennis and Nanus (as cited by Buzzell et al.) proclaimed that "leadership is not so much the exercise of power itself as the empowerment of others. Leaders are able to translate intentions into reality by aligning energies of the organization behind an attractive goal" (p. 1264). John 16:5-15 provides such a description of empowerment where Jesus informs his disciples that he would soon be leaving and empowering them to carry on his ministry.

In Act 2, Peter, who had previously denied knowing Jesus three times, preached a message that resulted in the salvation of 3,000 people (Buzzell et al., 1998). On the day of Pentecost, God sent the Holy Spirit to empower the church led by Peter to carry out the Great Commission. The intertextual analysis shows how much of the text of Acts 2 provides further insight into leadership and empowerment though much is taken from other texts.

Intertexture Analysis of Acts 2

The intertexture of Acts 2 is a compilation from different texts such as Hebrew texts like the Old Testament. Table 1 is an attempt to provide the references from the Bible for each verse in Acts 2. The column labeled "Bible References" provides the place within the Bible where the text in Acts 2 has its origins or can be found. The column labeled "Acts 2" contains individual verses from Acts 2. The column labeled "Intertexture References" is a compilation of intertexture references that inform the understanding of each particular verse in Acts 2. The combination of biblical references, verses, and the intertexture references provide a solid background on the intertexture of Acts 2.

Table 1: The Intertexture Analysis of Acts 2 Cross-Referenced with Biblical Text

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
Lev 23:15-16; Acts 20:16; Acts 1:14	2:1 Now ¹ when the day of Pentecost had come, they were all together in one place.	¹ tn <i>Grk</i> “And” Here <i>καί</i> (<i>kai</i>) has been translated as “now” to indicate the transition to a new topic. Greek style often begins sentences or clauses with “and,” but English style does not.
Acts 4:31	2:2 Suddenly ² a sound ³ like a violent wind blowing ⁴ came from heaven ⁵ and filled the entire house where they were sitting.	² tn Here <i>καί</i> (<i>kai</i>) has not been translated for stylistic reasons. ³ tn Or “a noise.” ⁴ tn While <i>φέρω</i> (<i>ferw</i>) generally refers to movement from one place to another with the possible implication of causing the movement of other objects, in Acts 2:2 <i>φέρομαι</i> (<i>feromai</i>) should probably be understood in a more idiomatic sense of “blowing” since it is combined with the noun for wind (<i>πνοή</i> , <i>pnoh</i>). ⁵ tn Or “from the sky.” The Greek word <i>οὐρανός</i> (<i>ouranos</i>) may be translated “sky” or “heaven” depending on the context.
	2:3 And tongues spreading out like a fire ⁶ appeared to them and came to rest on each one of them.	⁶ tn Or “And divided tongues as of fire.” The precise meaning of <i>διαμερίζομαι</i> (<i>diamerizomai</i>) in Acts 2:3 is difficult to determine. The meaning could be “tongues as of fire dividing up one to each person,” but it is also possible that the individual tongues of fire were divided (“And divided tongues as of fire appeared”). The translation adopted in the text (“tongues spreading out like a fire”) attempts to be somewhat ambiguous.
Mk 16:17; 1Cor 12:10	2:4 All ⁷ of them were filled with the Holy Spirit, and they began to speak in other languages ⁸ as the Spirit enabled them. ⁹	⁷ tn <i>Grk</i> “And all.” Because of the difference between Greek style, which often begins sentences. ⁸ tn for the tongues of fire. The Greek term is <i>γλώσσας</i> (<i>glwssai</i>), the same word used clauses with “and,” and English style, which generally does not, <i>καί</i> (<i>kai</i>) has not been translated here. sn Other languages. Acts 2:6-7 indicates that these were languages understandable to the hearers, a diverse group from “every nation under heaven.” ⁹ tn <i>Grk</i>

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
		<p>“just as the spirit gave them to utter.” The verb ἀποφθέγγομαι (apofqengomai) was used of special utterances in Classical Greek (BDAG 125 s.v.).</p>
Acts 8:2	<p>2:5 Now there were devout Jews¹⁰ from every nation under heaven residing in Jerusalem.¹¹</p> <p>2:6 When this sound¹² occurred, a crowd gathered and was in confusion,¹³ because each one heard them speaking in his own language.</p>	<p>¹⁰ tn <i>Grk</i> “Jews, devout men.” It is possible that only men are in view here in light of OT commands for Jewish men to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem at various times during the year (cf. Exod 23:17, 34:23; Deut 16:16). However, other evidence seems to indicate that both men and women might be in view. Luke 2:41-52 shows that whole families would make the temporary trip to Jerusalem. In addition, it is probable that the audience consisted of families who had taken up permanent residence in Jerusalem. The verb κατοικέω (katoikew) normally means “reside” or “dwell,” and archaeological evidence from tombs in Jerusalem does indicate that many families immigrated to Jerusalem permanently (see B. Witherington, <i>Acts</i>, 135); this would naturally include women. Also, the word ἀνήρ (ajnhr), which usually does mean “male” or “man” (as opposed to woman), sometimes is used generically to mean “a person” (BDAG 79 s.v. 2; cf. Matt 12:41). Given this evidence, then, it is conceivable that the audience in view here is not individual male pilgrims but a mixed group of men and women. <i>Grk</i> “Now there were residing in Jerusalem Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven.”</p> <p>¹² Or “this noise.” ¹³ tn Or “was bewildered.”</p>

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
ver. 12; Acts 1:11	2:7 Completely baffled, they said, ¹⁴ “Aren’t ¹⁵ all these who are speaking Galileans?	¹⁴ <i>Grk</i> “They were astounded and amazed, saying.” The two imperfect verbs, ἐξίσταντο (existanto) and ἐθαύμαζον (equamazon), show both the surprise and the confusion on the part of the hearers. The verb ἐξίσταντο (from ἐξίστημι, existhmi) often implies an illogical perception or response (BDAG 350 s.v. ἐξίστημι): “to be so astonished as to almost fail to comprehend what one has experienced” (L&N 25.218). ¹⁵ <i>tn Grk</i> “Behold, aren’t all these.” The Greek word ἰδοῦ (idou) at the beginning of this statement has not been translated because it has no exact English equivalent here, but adds interest and emphasis (BDAG 468 s.v. 1).
	2:8 And how is it that each one of us hears them ¹⁶ in our own native language? ¹⁷	¹⁶ <i>Grk</i> “we hear them, each one of us.” ¹⁷ <i>tn Grk</i> “in our own language in which we were born.”
1Pt 1:1; Acts 18:2; Acts 16:6; Rom 16:5; 1Cor 16:19; 2Cor 1:8	2:9 Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and the province of Asia, ¹⁸	¹⁸ <i>Grk</i> “Asia”; in the NT this always refers to the Roman province of Asia, made up of about one-third of the west and southwest end of modern Asia Minor. Asia lay to the west of the region of Phrygia and Galatia. The words “the province of” are supplied to indicate to the modern reader that this does not refer to the continent of Asia.
Acts 16:6; Acts 13:13; 15:38; Mt 27:32	2:10 Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya near Cyrene, ¹⁹ and visitors from Rome, ²⁰	¹⁹ According to BDAG 595 s.v. Λιβύη, the western part of Libya, Libya Cyrenaica, is referred to here (see also Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 16.6.1 [16.160] for a similar phrase). ²⁰ map for location see JP4 A1.
	2:11 both Jews and proselytes, ²¹ Cretans and Arabs—we hear them speaking in our own languages about the great deeds God has done!” ²²	²¹ <i>n Proselytes</i> refers to Gentile (i.e., non-Jewish) converts to Judaism. ²² <i>tn Or</i> “God’s mighty works.” Here the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ (tou qeou) has been translated as a subjective genitive.

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
1Cor 14:23	<p>2:12 All were astounded and greatly confused, saying to one another, “What does this mean?”</p> <p>2:13 But others jeered at the speakers,²³ saying, “They are drunk on new wine!”²⁴</p>	<p>²³ The words “the speakers” are not in the Greek text, but have been supplied for clarity. Direct objects were frequently omitted in Greek when clear from the context.²⁴ tn <i>Grk</i> “They are full of new wine!” sn New wine refers to a new, sweet wine in the process of fermentation.</p>
	<p>Peter’s Address on the Day of Pentecost</p>	
	<p>2:14 But Peter stood up²⁵ with the eleven, raised his voice, and addressed them: “You men of Judea²⁶ and all you who live in Jerusalem,²⁷ know this²⁸ and listen carefully to what I say.</p>	<p>²⁵ tn <i>Grk</i> “standing up.” The participle σταθείς (staiei) has been translated as a finite verb due to requirements of contemporary English style. ²⁶ tn Or “You Jewish men.” “Judea” is preferred here because it is paired with “Jerusalem,” a location. This suggests locality rather than ethnic background is the primary emphasis in the context. As for “men,” the Greek term here is ἀνὴρ (anhr), which only exceptionally is used in a generic sense of both males and females. In this context, where “all” who live in Jerusalem are addressed, it is conceivable that this is a generic usage, although it can also be argued that Peter’s remarks were addressed primarily to the men present, even if women were there.²⁷ ²⁸ know this²⁸ and listen carefully to what I say.</p>
1Thess 5:7	<p>2:15 In spite of what you think, these men are not drunk,²⁹ for it is only nine o’clock in the morning.³⁰</p>	<p>²⁹ for it is only nine o’clock in the morning.³⁰ tn <i>Grk</i> “only the third hour.”</p>
	<p>2:16 But this is what was spoken about through the prophet Joel:³¹</p>	<p>³¹ Note how in the quotation that follows all genders, ages, and classes are included. The event is like a hope Moses expressed in Num 11:29.</p>

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
Isa 44:3; Acts 10:45; Acts 21:9	2:17 ‘And in the last days ³² it will be,’ God says, ‘that I will pour out my Spirit on all people, ³³ and your sons and your daughters will prophesy, and your young men will see visions, and your old men will dream dreams.	³² The phrase <i>in the last days</i> is not quoted from Joel, but represents Peter’s interpretive explanation of the current events as falling “in the last days.” ³³ tn <i>Grk</i> “on all flesh.”
Acts 21:9-12	2:18 Even on my servants, ³⁴ both men and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days, and they will prophesy. ³⁵	³⁴ <i>Grk</i> “slaves.” Although this translation frequently renders δοῦλος (doulos) as “slave,” the connotation is often of one who has sold himself into slavery; in a spiritual sense, the idea is that of becoming a slave of God or of Jesus Christ voluntarily. The voluntary notion is not conspicuous here; hence, the translation “servants.” In any case, the word does not bear the connotation of a free individual serving another. BDAG notes that “‘servant’ for ‘slave’ is largely confined to Biblical transl. and early American times . . . in normal usage at the present time the two words are carefully distinguished” (BDAG 260 s.v.). The most accurate translation is “bondservant” (sometimes found in the ASV for δοῦλος), in that it often indicates one who sells himself into slavery to another. But as this is archaic, few today understand its force. ³⁵ sn The words and they will prophesy in Acts 2:18 are not quoted from Joel 2:29 at this point but are repeated from earlier in the quotation (Acts 2:17) for emphasis. Tongues speaking are described as prophecy, just like intelligible tongues are described in 1 Cor 14:26-33.
	2:19 And I will perform wonders in the sky ³⁶ above and miraculous signs ³⁷ on the earth below, blood and fire and clouds of smoke.	³⁶ Or “in the heaven.” The Greek word οὐρανός (ouranos) may be translated “sky” or “heaven” depending on the context. Here, in contrast to “the earth below,” a reference to the sky is more likely. ³⁷ tn Here the context

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
		indicates the miraculous nature of the signs mentioned; this is made explicit in the translation.
Mt 24:29	2:20 The sun will be changed to darkness and the moon to blood before the great and glorious ³⁸ day of the Lord comes.	³⁸ tn Or “and wonderful.”
Rom 10:13	2:21 And then ³⁹ everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.’ ⁴⁰	³⁹ n <i>Grk</i> “And it will be that.” ⁴⁰ sn A quotation from Joel 2:28-32.
Jn 4:48; Acts 10:38; Jn 3:2	2:22 “Men of Israel, ⁴¹ listen to these words: Jesus the Nazarene, a man clearly attested to you by God with powerful deeds, ⁴² wonders, and miraculous signs ⁴³ that God performed among you through him, just as you yourselves know—	⁴¹ tn Or “Israelite men,” although this is less natural English. The Greek term here is ἀνὴρ (anhr), which only exceptionally is used in a generic sense of both males and females. In this context, it is conceivable that this is a generic usage, although it can also be argued that Peter’s remarks were addressed primarily to the men present, even if women were there. ⁴² tn Or “miraculous deeds.” ⁴³ tn Again, the context indicates the miraculous nature of these signs, and this is specified in the translation.
Lk 22:22; Acts 3:18; 4:28; Lk 24:20; Acts 3:13	2:23 this man, who was handed over by the predetermined plan and foreknowledge of God, you executed ⁴⁴ by nailing him to a cross at the hands of Gentiles. ⁴⁵	⁴⁴ tn Or “you killed.” ⁴⁵ tn <i>Grk</i> “at the hands of lawless men.” At this point the term ἄνομος (anomo) refers to non-Jews who live outside the Jewish (Mosaic) law, rather than people who broke any or all laws including secular laws. Specifically it is a reference to the Roman soldiers who carried out Jesus’ crucifixion.
Ver 32; 1Cor 6:14; 2Cor 4:14; Eph 1:20; Col 2:12; Heb 13:20; 1Pt 1:21; Jn 20:9	2:24 But God raised him up, ⁴⁶ having released ⁴⁷ him from the pains ⁴⁸ of death, because it was not possible for him to be held in its power. ⁴⁹	⁴⁶ tn <i>Grk</i> “Whom God raised up.” ⁴⁷ tn Or “having freed.” ⁴⁸ sn The term translated pains is frequently used to describe pains associated with giving birth (see Rev 12:2). So there is irony here in the mixed metaphor. ⁴⁹ tn Or “for him to be held by it” (in either case, “it” refers to death’s power).

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
	2:25 For David says about him, 'I saw the Lord always in front of me, ⁵⁰ for he is at my right hand so that I will not be shaken.	⁵⁰ tn Or "having freed."
	2:26 Therefore my heart was glad and my tongue rejoiced; my body ⁵¹ also will live in hope,	⁵¹ <i>Grk</i> "my flesh."
Ver 31; Acts 13:35	2:27 because you will not leave my soul in Hades, ⁵² nor permit your Holy One to experience ⁵³ decay.	⁵² tn Or "will not abandon my soul to Hades." Often "Hades" is the equivalent of the Hebrew term Sheol, the place of the dead. ⁵³ tn <i>Grk</i> "to see," but the literal translation of the phrase "to see decay" could be misunderstood to mean simply "to look at decay," while here "see decay" is really figurative for "experience decay."
	2:28 You have made known to me the paths of life; you will make me full of joy with your presence. ⁵⁴	⁵⁴ sn A quotation from Ps 16:8-11.
Acts 7:8-9; Acts 13:36; 1Kgs 2:10; Neh 3:16	2:29 "Brothers, ⁵⁵ I can speak confidently ⁵⁶ to you about our forefather ⁵⁷ David, that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us to this day.	⁵⁵ tn Since this represents a continuation of the address beginning in v.14 and continued in v. 22; "brothers" has been used here rather than a generic expression like "brothers and sisters." ⁵⁶ sn Peter's certainties are based on well-known facts. ⁵⁷ tn Or "about our noted ancestor," "about the patriarch."
2Sm 7:12; Ps 132:11	2:30 So then, because ⁵⁸ he was a prophet and knew that God had sworn to him with an oath to seat one of his descendants ⁵⁹ on his throne, ⁶⁰	⁵⁸ tn The participles ὑπάρχων (<i>Juparcwn</i>) and εἰδώς (<i>eidw</i>) are translated as causal adverbial participles. ⁵⁹ tn <i>Grk</i> "one from the fruit of his loins." "Loins" is the traditional translation of ὀσφῦς (<i>osfu</i>), referring to the male genital organs. A literal rendering like "one who came from his genital organs" would be regarded as too specific and perhaps even vulgar by many

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
Ps 16:10	2:31 David by foreseeing this ⁶¹ spoke about the resurrection of the Christ, ⁶² that he was neither abandoned to Hades, ⁶³ nor did his body ⁶⁴ experience ⁶⁵ decay. ⁶⁶	<p>contemporary readers. Most modern translations thus render the phrase “one of his descendants.”⁶⁰ sn An allusion to Ps 132:11 and 2 Sam 7:12-13, the promise in the Davidic covenant.</p> <p>⁶¹ tn <i>Grk</i> “David foreseeing spoke.” The participle προῖδών (proidwn) is taken as indicating means. It could also be translated as a participle of attendant circumstance: “David foresaw [this] and spoke.” The word “this” is supplied in either case as an understood direct object (direct objects in Greek were often omitted, but must be supplied for the modern English reader).⁶² tn Or “the Messiah”; both “Christ” (Greek) and “Messiah” (Hebrew and Aramaic) mean “one who has been anointed.” sn The term χριστός (cristos) was originally an adjective (“anointed”), developing in LXX into a substantive (“an anointed one”), then developing still further into a technical generic term (“the anointed one”). In the intertestamental period it developed further into a technical term referring to the hoped-for anointed one, that is, a specific individual. In the NT the development starts there (technical-specific), is so used in the gospels, and then develops in Paul’s letters to mean virtually Jesus’ last name.⁶³ tn Or “abandoned in the world of the dead.” The translation “world of the dead” for Hades is suggested by L&N 1.19. The phrase is an allusion to Ps 16:10.⁶⁴ tn <i>Grk</i> “flesh.” See vv. 26b-27. The reference to “body” in this verse picks up the reference to “body” in v. 26. The Greek term σάρξ (sarx) in both verses literally means “flesh”; however, the translation “body” stresses the lack of decay of his physical body. The point of the verse is not merely the lack of decay of his flesh alone, but the resurrection of his entire person, as indicated by the previous parallel line “he was not abandoned to Hades.”⁶⁵ tn <i>Grk</i> “see,” but the literal translation of the</p>

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
Ver 24; Acts 1:8	2:32 This Jesus God raised up, and we are all witnesses of it. ⁶⁷	phrase “see decay” could be misunderstood to mean simply “look at decay,” while here “see decay” is really figurative for “experience decay.” ⁶⁶ sn An allusion to Ps 16:10. ⁶⁷ tn Or “of him”; <i>Grk</i> “of which [or whom] we are all witnesses” (Acts 1:8).
Phil 2:9; Mk 16:19; Acts 1:4; Jn 7:39; 14-26; Acts 10:45	2:33 So then, exalted ⁶⁸ to the right hand ⁶⁹ of God, and having received ⁷⁰ the promise of the Holy Spirit ⁷¹ from the Father, he has poured out ⁷² what you both see and hear.	⁶⁸ tn The aorist participle ὑψωθεῖς (Juywqei) could be taken temporally: “So then, after he was exalted. . .” In the translation the more neutral “exalted” (a shorter form of “having been exalted”) was used to preserve the ambiguity of the original Greek. ⁶⁹ sn The expression the right hand of God represents supreme power and authority. Its use here sets up the quotation of Ps 110:1 in v. 34. ⁷⁰ tn The aorist participle λαβών (labwn) could be taken temporally: “So then, after he was exalted . . . and received from the Father the promised Holy Spirit.” In the translation the more neutral “having received” was used to preserve the ambiguity of the original Greek. ⁷¹ tn Here the genitive τοῦ πνεύματος (tou pneumato) is a genitive of apposition; the promise consists of the Holy Spirit. ⁷² sn The use of the verb poured out looks back to 2:17-18, where the same verb occurs twice.
	2:34 For David did not ascend into heaven, but he himself says, “The Lord said to my lord, ‘Sit ⁷³ at my right hand	⁷³ sn Sit at my right hand. The word “sit” alludes back to the promise of “seating one on his throne” in v. 30.
Ps 110:1; Mt 22:44	2:35 until I make your enemies a footstool ⁷⁴ for your feet.” ⁷⁵	⁷⁴ sn The metaphor “make your enemies a footstool” portrays the complete subjugation of the enemies. ⁷⁵ sn A quotation from Ps 110:1, one of the most often-cited OT passages in the NT, pointing to the exaltation of Jesus.

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
Lk 2:11	2:36 Therefore let all the house of Israel know beyond a doubt ⁷⁶ that God has made this Jesus whom you crucified ⁷⁷ both Lord ⁷⁸ and Christ.” ⁷⁹	⁷⁶ tn Or “know for certain.” This term is in an emphatic position in the clause. ⁷⁷ tn <i>Grk</i> “has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified.” The clause has been simplified in the translation by replacing the pronoun “him” with the explanatory clause “this Jesus whom you crucified” which comes at the end of the sentence. ⁷⁸ sn Lord. This looks back to the quotation of Ps 110:1 and the mention of “calling on the Lord” in 2:21. Peter’s point is that the Lord on whom one calls for salvation is Jesus, because he is the one mediating God’s blessing of the Spirit as a sign of the presence of salvation and the last days. ⁷⁹ tn Or “and Messiah”; both “Christ” (Greek) and “Messiah” (Hebrew and Aramaic) mean “one who has been anointed.” sn See the note on Christ in 2:31.
The Response to Peter’s Address		
Lk 3:10; 12; 14	2:37 Now when they heard this, ⁸⁰ they were acutely distressed ⁸¹ and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, “What should we do, brothers?”	⁸⁰ tn The word “this” is not in the Greek text. Direct objects were often omitted in Greek, but must be supplied for the modern English reader. ⁸¹ tn <i>Grk</i> “they were pierced to the heart” (an idiom for acute emotional distress).
Acts 8:8;12; 16; 36; 38; 22:16; Lk 24:47; Acts 3:19	2:38 Peter said to them, “Repent, and each one of you be baptized ⁸² in the name of Jesus Christ ⁸³ for ⁸⁴ the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. ⁸⁵	⁸² tn The verb is a third person imperative, but the common translation “let each of you be baptized” obscures the imperative force in English, since it sounds more like a permissive (“each of you may be baptized”) to the average English reader. ⁸³ tn Or “Messiah”; both “Christ” (Greek) and “Messiah” (Hebrew and Aramaic) mean “one who has been anointed.” sn In the name of Jesus Christ. Baptism in Messiah Jesus’ name shows how much authority he possesses. ⁸⁴ tn There is debate over the meaning of εἰς in the prepositional phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν (eis afesin twm Jamartiwn Jumwn, “for/because of/with reference to the forgiveness of your

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
		<p>sins”). Although a causal sense has been argued, it is difficult to maintain here. ExSyn 369-71 discusses at least four other ways of dealing with the passage: (1) The baptism referred to here is physical only, and εἰς has the meaning of “for” or “unto.” Such a view suggests that salvation is based on works—an idea that runs counter to the theology of Acts, namely: (a) repentance often precedes baptism (cf. Acts 3:19; 26:20), and (b) salvation is entirely a gift of God, not procured via water baptism (Acts 10:43 [cf. v. 47]; 13:38-39, 48; 15:11; 16:30-31; 20:21; 26:18). (2) The baptism referred to here is spiritual only. Although such a view fits well with the theology of Acts, it does not fit well with the obvious meaning of “baptism” in Acts — especially in this text (cf. 2:41). (3) The text should be repunctuated in light of the shift from second person plural to third person singular back to second person plural again. The idea then would be, “Repent for/with reference to your sins, and let each one of you be baptized...” Such a view is an acceptable way of handling εἰς, but its subtlety and awkwardness count against it. (4) Finally, it is possible that to a 1st-century Jewish audience (as well as to Peter), the idea of baptism might incorporate both the spiritual reality and the physical symbol. That Peter connects both closely in his thinking is clear from other passages such as Acts 10:47 and 11:15-16. If this interpretation is correct, then Acts 2:38 is saying very little about the specific theological relationship between the symbol and the reality, only that historically they were viewed together. One must look in other places for a theological analysis. For further discussion see R. N. Longenecker, “Acts,” EBC 9:283-85; B. Witherington, <i>Acts</i>, 154-55; F. F. Bruce, <i>The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary</i>, 129-30; BDAG 290 s.v. εἰς 4.f.⁸⁵ tn Here the genitive τοῦ</p>

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
		ἁγίου πνεύματος (tou Jagiou pneumato) is a genitive of apposition; the gift consists of the Holy Spirit.
Isa 44:3; Acts 10:45; Eph 2:13	2:39 For the promise ⁸⁶ is for you and your children, and for all who are far away, as many as the Lord our God will call to himself.”	⁸⁶ sn The promise refers to the promise of the Holy Spirit that Jesus received from the Father in 2:33 and which he now pours out on others. The promise consists of the Holy Spirit (see note in 2:33). Jesus is the active mediator of God’s blessing.
Dt 32:5	2:40 With many other words he testified ⁸⁷ and exhorted them saying, “Save yourselves from this perverse ⁸⁸ generation!”	⁸⁷ tn Or “warned.” ⁸⁸ tn Or “crooked” (in a moral or ethical sense). See Luke 3:5.
	2:41 So those who accepted ⁸⁹ his message ⁹⁰ were baptized, and that day about three thousand people ⁹¹ were added. ⁹²	⁸⁹ tn Or “who acknowledged the truth of.” ⁹⁰ tn <i>Grk</i> “word.” ⁹¹ tn <i>Grk</i> “souls” (here an idiom for the whole person). ⁹² tn Or “were won over.”
	The Fellowship of the Early Believers	
Acts 1:14	2:42 They were devoting themselves to the apostles’ teaching and to fellowship, ⁹³ to the breaking of bread and to prayer. ⁹⁴	⁹³ sn Fellowship refers here to close association involving mutual involvement and relationships. ⁹⁴ tn <i>Grk</i> “prayers.” This word was translated as a collective singular in keeping with English style.
Acts 5: 12	2:43 Reverential awe ⁹⁵ came over everyone, ⁹⁶ and many wonders and miraculous signs ⁹⁷ came about by the apostles.	⁹⁵ tn Or “Fear.” ⁹⁶ tn <i>Grk</i> “on every soul” (here “soul” is an idiom for the whole person). ⁹⁷ tn In this context the miraculous nature of these signs is implied. Cf. BDAG 920 s.v. σημεῖον 2.a.
Acts 4:32	2:44 All who believed were together and held ⁹⁸ everything in common,	⁹⁸ tn <i>Grk</i> “had.”

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
Mt 19:21	2:45 and they began selling ⁹⁹ their property ¹⁰⁰ and possessions and distributing the proceeds ¹⁰¹ to everyone, as anyone had need.	⁹⁹ tn The imperfect verb has been translated as an ingressive (“began...”). Since in context this is a description of the beginning of the community of believers, it is more likely that these statements refer to the start of various activities and practices that the early church continued for some time. ¹⁰⁰ tn It is possible that the first term for property (κτήματα, kthmata) refers to real estate (as later usage seems to indicate) while the second term (ὑπάρξεις, Juparxeis) refers to possessions in general, but it may also be that the two terms are used together for emphasis, simply indicating that all kinds of possessions were being sold. However, if the first term is more specifically a reference to real estate, it foreshadows the incident with Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5:1-11. ¹⁰¹ tn <i>Grk</i> “distributing them” (αὐτά, auta). The referent (the proceeds of the sales) has been specified in the translation for clarity.
Lk 24:53; Acts 5:21; 42; Acts 20:7	2:46 Every day ¹⁰² they continued to gather together by common consent in the temple courts, ¹⁰³ breaking bread from ¹⁰⁴ house to house, sharing their food with glad ¹⁰⁵ and humble hearts, ¹⁰⁶	¹⁰² tn BDAG 437 s.v. ἡμέρα 2.c has “every day” for this phrase. ¹⁰³ tn <i>Grk</i> “in the temple.” This is actually a reference to the courts surrounding the temple proper, and has been translated accordingly. ¹⁰⁴ tn Here κατά (kata) is used as a distributive (BDAG 512 s.v. B.1.d). ¹⁰⁵ sn The term glad (<i>Grk</i> “gladness”) often refers to joy brought about by God’s saving acts (Luke 1:14, 44; also the related verb in 1:47; 10:21). ¹⁰⁶ tn <i>Grk</i> “with gladness and humbleness of hearts.” It is best to understand καρδίας (kardias) as an attributed genitive, with the two nouns it modifies actually listing attributes of the genitive noun which is related to them.

Bible Ref	Acts 2	Intertexture References
Ro 14:18; Ver 41; Acts 5:14	2:47 praising God and having the good will ¹⁰⁷ of all the people. And the Lord was adding to their number every day ¹⁰⁸ those who were being saved.	¹⁰⁷ tn Or “the favor.” ¹⁰⁸ tn BDAG 437 s.v. ἡμέρα 2.c has “every day” for this phrase.

Note: The data in columns 1 and 2 are from *The Leadership Bible: Leadership Principles from God’s Word* (p. 1279-1280), by S. Buzzell, K. Boa, and B. Perkins (Eds.), 1998, Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation. Copyright 1998 by The Zondervan Corporation. The data in column 3 are from Acts 2. Retrieved September 27, 2008, from Bible.org: <http://net.bible.org/bible>.

There are two distinct themes inside Acts 2: empowerment and interpersonal relationships. As the narrative progresses, one can see that individuals were filled with the Holy Spirit and heard the message of God in their own language. They were empowered to praise the wonders of God in their own native language. Then, as Peter addressed the crowd, they discovered the transformational story of Jesus told by Peter ensured that the Word of God would live on. The tension of this meeting subsides with Peter taking the situational leadership approach, sometimes referred to as the contingency theory of leadership (Middleton, 2006). The effectiveness of alternative leadership styles depends on significant elements of the situation.

The situational elements include the telling, selling, participating, and delegating of the roles of a leader that have influence on the task, the followers, and other organizational and environmental factors, as well as on the leader (Yukl, 2002). Acts 2:14-40 explores the importance of interpersonal relationships. Stacey (2007), who explored the interactions between people, understood this phenomenon as the cause of changing strategies, movement in organizations, and the evolution from the present status quo. Acts 2 is an excellent example of this interrelationship developing growing patterns. At first, a few received the Word of God and they went back to their lands and told others what they had learned. These patterns developed first between individuals, then to groups, and eventually to whole societies just as Stacey’s theory predicts change occurs. This pattern of constant movement and emerging partnerships causes strategies and organizational change to happen through a series of interactions and interconnections. Stacey posited that this process of movement and emergence is a complex responsive process of interrelationships where each conversation can change past patterns and new meanings can emerge. Acts 2 is an excellent example of Stacey’s theory which provides a fuller understanding of the process of emergence through empowerment and interrelationships.

In an attempt to understand these phenomena, Bekker (2006) iterated that the analysis “attempts to integrate the tools of both ancient and modern rhetorical criticism into socio-rhetorical analysis of texts” (p. 41). The texture highlights patterns of questions, answers, blessings, pronouncements, promises, commands, statements teaching, wisdom sayings, and prophetic prediction. Acts 2 highlights the relationship between the human and the divine through a transformation where the student becomes the teacher. This humanization is in a form of inner transformation “denoted by theosis and is never far removed from the program of God in discipling the nations. When humanization is held in proper relationship with divinization, the results can be world-historical” (Niewold, 2007, p. 125). Niewold provided one example of this

type of transformation found in the abolition of slavery in early 19th-century England under the influence of William Wilberforce. It highlights an instance of this kind of biblical and theological humanization. The emerging conversation and the interrelationships that were transported across the land and waters changed the moral structure of slavery, just as the Word of God transformed understanding. This realism counteracted the relativism and skepticism in the minds of those who once believed slavery was acceptable, but the interactions and interconnections of people changed the moral reality of slavery. Stacey again provided the foundation to understand this change as a process of interactions. For example, in Acts 2:42 Luke states, “They were devoting themselves to the apostles’ teaching and to fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to prayer.” The intertexture of fellowship refers to close association involving mutual involvement and relationships.

Acts 2 and Leadership

There are numerous leadership theories and models that can be used to draw further insight from the text in order to better understand divine empowerment. The principles found in Acts 2 are reflected in the overall principles of the life and ministry of Jesus (Yost & Tracey, 1997). Yost and Tracey stated, “For three years, He worked with 12 apostles and then left them in charge to train others who trained others, who trained others, and so forth” (p. 1). In Acts 2, Peter stood up with the other 11 and explained what was happening and asked others to believe in something they have never seen before—which is the very meaning of trust. Clearly Peter was still in teaching mode for, as Yost and Tracey posited, “to train is a process that must go on constantly if skills, attitudes, and knowledge are to be passed on from generation to generation and culture to culture” (p. 1). Peter’s leadership provided the atmosphere for his disciples to learn and to teach others about his ministry (Fulmer, 2000; Streatfield, 2001; Tuan & Ryan, 2000). For new skills, information, and attitudes to be transferred across cultures over time the intertextual analysis of Acts 2 could communicate important principles across communities (Foster, 1986). Peter’s ability to step forward for the greater good of learning and molding others is an example of leadership; specifically, servant leadership which helps others understand and further the conversation for continued learning (Ayers, 2006; Fry, 2003; Greenleaf, 1977; Hickman, 1998; Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Winston, 2002).

Servant Leadership

Greenleaf’s (1977) influential effort in coining the phrase *servant leadership* brought the phrase itself into usage in the organizational leadership community (Fry, 2003; Winston, 2002). Ayers (2006) stated, “His research posits that leadership practiced in a manner consistent with the divine attributes of Jesus’ servant character is effective and influential” (p. 8). Acts 2 gives an example of the effective and influential ministry of Jesus carried on by Peter. Jesus had to reconcile Peter before Jesus could build his church on the rock that Peter was to become. Ayers further noted, “Though by omission it is readily seen that the construct of servant leadership has not yet become a recognized part of conventional leadership literature, Greenleaf introduced practical theology into leadership theory” (p. 8) and gave an excellent theoretical lens from which to interpret scripture.

For example, the Beatitudes (Matthew 5) show us that leaders are to be servers, or servants. Greenleaf (1977) interpreted this to mean be a servant first, as though this was merely the precursor to being a leader. As a matter of fact, he specifically stated that some servants aspire to lead. However, Jesus told his disciples that whoever desires to be first must be last and the servant of all (Mark 9:35). From this we can interpret that all of us are expected to lead by being servants. In other words, a leader is always a server and his or her role is more about supporting, enabling, and facilitating than about control or authority. Clearly Acts 2 was an example of servant leadership.

Theory X Leadership Theory

Theory X presumes people dislike work, shirk responsibility, seek formal direction whenever possible, and must be coerced, controlled, or threatened with punishment to achieve desired goals. Theory X information is control oriented and detailed. Though Peter could have used a theory X approach, he did not do so in Acts 2. However, as shown in Acts 8:14-17, Peter used his power of persuasion “because the Holy Spirit had not yet come upon any of them.” Peter had to take the non-believers and make them into believers, just as has to be done in theory Y instances.

Theory Y Leadership Theory

Alternatively, the theory Y assumption is that people like to work, will exercise self direction and self control, seek responsibility, make good decisions, and have a high degree of creativity. From the theory Y perspective, people can process more information that is more complex than people viewed from the theory X perspective. Peter had a tendency to change between the X and Y leadership theories throughout his ministry to ensure that he got his message across to his followers. An example of Peter’s use of theory Y is seen in Acts 2:42 where Luke writes, “They were devoting themselves to the apostles’ teaching and to fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to prayer.” The *fellowship* refers to close association involving mutual involvement and relationships in which people themselves provide the willingness to further the Word.

Jesus, as a leader, often used a theory Y approach. He developed a vision of the future, motivated his disciples, communicated well with them, requested their cooperation, inspired rather than controlled, was externally oriented to the outside world, and thrived in a complex community.

Situational Leadership

The situational approach highlights properties of an effective leadership style depending on the complex situation that has arisen. The varying circumstances between situations, including task and relational structure, superior-subordinate interactions, the motivation of followers, or numerous other factors, would be indicators of the need for distinct leadership approaches (Manchester, 1983; Middleton, 2006). Hersey and Blanchard’s (1978) situational leadership theory links to Simmons’ interrogative criteria for follower readiness (adapted from Hackman and Johnson by Simmons as cited in Middleton). The situational leadership theory

identifies the level of maturity of the follower as a key factor in determining appropriate leadership behavior. Different levels of member maturity call for different leader behavior in different circumstances. For instance, the newer, less experienced, or less mature member of an organization will need to be told about the mission and vision of the organization, the relationship of the members, and service opportunities. The relationship is highly focused on the tasks at hand and less focused on relationship building. This is the *telling* phase, the first of four stages of the leader-member relationship. The other stages are *selling*, *participating*, and *delegating*. Acts 2 can be used to illustrate Peter's methodology of telling, selling, participating and delegating the mission of his ministry to his followers. His guidance as an agent of change is clear where Peter initially tells the followers what to do, then sells them on the importance of the message. He then participates with them in ministry and builds up his followers. By empowering the followers to pass the message of God to others, Peter finally delegates to others to further the ministry itself. In Acts 2:1-8, the baton is passed to Peter to testify to Jesus' teachings of "follow me!" (Bass, 1990; Burns, 2003; Buzzell et al., 1998; Greenleaf, 1977; Stacey, 2000, 2001, 2007).

Complex Responsive Processes of Relating Theory

How Jesus carried out the leadership that continues to change the world is found in Stacey's complex responsive processes of relating theory. Stacey (2007) posited that this complex process of interrelations develops the community of individuals, groups, organizations and society. Thus, the teachings of the Word are explicated through complex interactions between people who in turn pass that information to other people and change the world through an indefinite series of interactions (Burton & Obel, 2004). This is seen in Acts 2 in Peter's interactions in the fellowship of believers as the followers devoted themselves to the teachings and breaking of bread in prayer. In Acts 2:3, Luke states, "And tongues spreading out like a fire appeared to them and came to rest on each one of them." Although the precise meaning of tongues of fire is difficult to determine, it is also possible that the individual tongues of fire were divided into infinite individuals carrying the Word throughout the land. These infinite interactions are ongoing every day and each one has within it the possibility of changing the future a little bit (Stacey). The ministry and leadership of Peter remains as the desire to communicate amongst peoples still remain (Niewold, 2007).

Acts 2 and Trust

In understanding the differences and characteristics of trust, one should be aware of the multidisciplinary view of the trust phenomena (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). Economists view trust as calculative or institutional, psychologists view trust as a host of internal cognitions that personal attributes yield, and sociologists find trust imbedded in relationships between people. Rousseau et al. posited that a cross disciplinary view of trust is a psychological state where it is the intention "to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another" (p. 395). Peter needed his followers to trust him enough to be able to empower them with the Word of God so they could go forth to pass that message to others.

The critical time frame for people within an organization to build and develop trust is at the beginning of their relationships as shown by Peter and the 11. (McKnight, Cummings, &

Chervany, 1998). McKnight et al. take a divergent view of how trust builds from traditional theorists (citing Blau [1964]; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna [1985]; Zand [1972]) who posited that trust is built slowly over time.

Initial thinking was that trust in new relationships is based on a person's experiences, firsthand knowledge of the other party, or an individual's disposition. McKnight et al. (1998) posed that a high level of trust develops early in a relationship but may diminish over time as trust-reducing instances accumulate over time. Das and Teng (1998) wrote that a firm needs confidence in a partner's cooperative behavior because it is critical to a business relationship. Having the ability to maintain a certain level of control leads to one's own willingness to assume more risk in the relationship. Acts 2 provides insight on how Peter had to introduce the Word of God into a community of nonbelievers, and to mold their beliefs through a trusting relationship.

Trust Building and Empowerment

Koeszegi (2004) provided insight into trust-building strategies in inter-organizational negotiations where the interdependence of customers, collaborators, competitors, governments, and stakeholder relationships are critical to the successful conduct of business between all parties. The dynamics of such a relationship depends on the ability to build a trusting relationship, thus empowering employees and clients to be able to operate through the transactional negotiations (Koeszegi). Trust and empowerment, according to Koeszegi, is multidimensional. A trusting attitude may not be the only attribute needed as the relationship is also based on a rational calculation of acceptable risk. Therefore, trust requires choice. The interdependency between the parties is an important factor in building a successful relationship. As Peter developed a relation of trust, he was able to empower his followers to go forth and teach others and to develop a process of providing the Word of God to others around the world.

Williams (n.d.) concluded that trust is insufficient to prompt a non-self-interested behavior and that reciprocity without trust is sufficient to explain cooperation and the lack of empowerment in many instances. William's paper concluded that people doing business are more a result of altruistic cooperation rather than inherent trust. McAllister, Lewicki, and Chaturvedi (2006, citing Lewicki and Bunker [1995, 1996]) provided a multi-dimensional conceptual framework for understanding the facets of trust within interpersonal relationships.

Climate and Culture

The conceptualization of trust and empowerment is a social relationship according to the accountability theory model proposed by Frink and Klimoski (as cited by Ammeter, Douglas, Ferris, & Goka, 2004). The role of trust, empowerment, and accountability is central to all transactions between individuals and organizational elements according to Ammeter et al. Trust is described as "a general belief in the goodness of others" (p. 49). Without trust, what is taken for granted in everyday life is not possible. Peter could not have furthered his ministry without first building trust. Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna (1985, as cited in Ammeter et al.) suggested that dependability, or trust placed in another person, is a key indicator of a trusting relationship. Frink and Klimoski (1985) and Katz and Kahn (1978, as cited by Ammeter et al.) posited that accountability, empowerment, and shared accountability are based on a social aspect of responsibility.

Shapiro (1987) wrote that impersonal trust is not imbedded in structures of personal relationships and they in turn do not have the same control mechanisms with societal constraints. To Shapiro, trust is described as a social phenomenon where one invests resources, authority, and responsibility in another. The proliferation of these impersonal social relationships increase further as one is removed from the personal context of a trust relationship. Empowerment is not often given in these relationships.

Interpersonal trust on the other hand is an aspect of a close relationship which is perceived by intimate partners in a dyadic trust environment (Lazelere & Huston, 1980). This trust relationship is an integral part of such relationships. Trust increases security and empowerment, reduces inhibitions and defensiveness, and frees people to share feelings and dreams. This type of dyadic trust is a prerequisite for commitment to teaching the Word of God and the furthering Peter's ministry.

Trust and Distrust

The complexity of relationships show that the study of intertexture is differentiating the enduring, eternal character of the divine message of salvation in Acts from an inspiring secular message which may be received, processed, and even fondly remembered and passed on as history. The latter lacks the living fire of the message of eternal salvation. Personal power or the power of personality, charisma, and etc. comes as close to Jesus' power of personality as mortals can get (Bass, 1998). Many different trust factors shape social relations as there are normally both trust and distrust in most relationships (Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998). Lewicki et al. provided some background on how there is a dichotomous relationship between trust and distrust as it is perceived by another person. Lewicki et al. argued that trust and distrust are separate entities, but linked dimensions. Peter also used this concept throughout his ministry as he knew others distrusted him and the message he was providing to them. To gain their trust, Peter had to work hard to make his message clear to others and to have their understanding of him not emerge from preconceived ideas. As the knowledge increased, so did the trust. The interrelationships of the believers increased through trust and the carrying of the Word proliferated throughout the land.

Weaving the Word throughout Jesus' Message

In the beginning was the Word—*logos*—God. Therefore, in the case of Jesus, the Word both carries and is the message (Buzzell et al., 1998). The secular transfer of power can approach Jesus' model of personally passing the message. The study of intertexture is differentiating the enduring, eternal character of the divine message of salvation in Acts from an inspiring secular message which may be received and processed and even fondly remembered and passed on as history. The latter lacks the living fire of the message of eternal salvation. Personal power or the power of personality, charisma, and etc. comes as close to Jesus' power of personality as mortals can get (Bass, 1998). But the elements that make up the trustworthy leader are like those we see in the personality and character of Jesus', the perfect God-in-man (Greenleaf, 1977). Also, what breathes life or power or inspiration into people as they pass the Word on comes from both within the person hearing the Word and from the person passing on the Word (Buzzell et al.). There's a difference between the uninspired word and the inspired Word being passed on. The

passer will be held accountable and only the inspired Word will be accepted because the hearer is spiritually receptive. There's something about the Word itself, the text, if you will. It needs to be passed, received, stored, acted on, and then passed on again (de Silva, 2004).

The trust is derived from the knowledge of (words about, the text about) the person (Fukuyama, 1995). Why is there no trust among thieves? Their words don't stand scrutiny. Their words and actions don't meet any objective moral standard. One can apply a little formula about existentialism to this: existentialists (i.e., liars) are who they are because they do what they do. If they do or say it today, it's right today, and it's hard to pick an objective standard related to that. The trustworthy leader does what he does because he is who or what he is every day or most of the time. The weight of his word usually meets the objective moral standard that the listener holds.

Summary

In sum, this article developed an intertextual analysis of Acts 2 through other sources such as the New Testament, early Christian writings, Jewish apocryphal, and psuedopedigraphical texts (de Silva, 2004). Further analysis of Acts 2 included an intertextual analysis identifying biblical references where the original text was found and then compared to the text in Acts 2. Additional illumination of Acts 2 was produced by reviewing a number of leadership theories and developing connections between these theories and the activities, conversations, and narration in Acts 2. Finally, the article explored divine leadership through trust, interrelationships, and empowerment. The intertextual analysis provided understanding of the social, humanistic, historical, and psychological aspects of the texture of Acts 2. Through this analysis one can see the connections to leadership challenges of the 21st century through scholarly leadership theories.

About the Author

Tom Norbutus manages the Joint Forces Command Board of Directors' process in his present position with Northrop Grumman in Norfolk, Va. He earned his bachelor's degree from Norwich University in business administration and a Master's of Business Administration from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Daytona Beach, Fla. He is a retired lieutenant colonel from the United States Air Force and has worked in the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Homeland Security, and the Central Intelligence Agency. He is pursuing a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership at Regent University's School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship.

Email: thomnol@regent.edu

References

- Ammeter, A. P., Douglas, C., Ferris, G. R., & Goka, H. (2004). A social relationship conceptualization of trust and accountability in organizations. *Human Resources Management Review*, 14, 47-65.

- Ayers, M. (2006). Toward a theology of leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 1(1), 3-27.
- Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military and educational impact*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bekker, C. D. (2006). *Exploring leadership through exegesis*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: The new pursuit of happiness*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Burton, R. M., & Obel, B. (2004). *Strategic organizational diagnosis and design: The dynamics of fit*. New York: Springer.
- Buzzell, S., Boa, K., & Perkins, B. (Eds.). (1998). *The leadership Bible: Leadership principles from God's word*. Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation.
- Das, T., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation alliances. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 491-512.
- de Silva, D. A. (2004). *An introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, methods, and ministry formation*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Foster, R. (1986). *Innovation: The attacker's advantage*. New York: Summit Books.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 719.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Fulmer, W. E. (2000). *Shaping the adaptive organization: Landscapes, learning, and leadership in volatile times*. New York: AMACOM, American Management Association.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1978). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hickman, G. R. (1998). *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Koeszegi, A. T. (2004). Trust building strategies in inter-organizational negotiations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(6), 640-660.
- Kramer, R. M., & Tyler, T. R. (1996). *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lazalere, R. E., & Huston, T. L. (1980). The dyadic trust scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42(3), 595-985.
- Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 438-458.
- Manchester, W. (1983). *The last lion: Winston Spencer Churchill, visions of glory 1874-1932*. Little, Brown and Company: Boston, New York and London.
- McAllister, D. J., Lewicki, R. J., & Chaturvedi, S. (2006). *Trust in developing relationships: From theory to measurement*. Academy of Management Best Conference Paper 2006.

- McKnight, D., Cummings, L. I., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 473-490.
- Middleton, G. R. (2006). The Epistle to the Ephesians: Instilling values using situational leadership. *Journal of Biblical Leadership*, 26-48.
- Niewold, J. (2007). Beyond servant leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 1(2), 118-134.
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Poon, R. (2006). John 21: A Johannine model of leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 1(1), 49-70.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *Exploring the texture of texts: A guide to socio-rhetorical interpretation*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 393-404.
- Shapiro, S. P. (1987). The social control of impersonal trust. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 93(3), 623-658.
- Stacey, R. (2001). *Complex responsive processes in organisations: Learning and knowledge creation*. London: Routledge.
- Stacey, R. (2003). *Strategic management of organisational dynamics: The challenge of complexity*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Stacey, R. (2007). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics: The challenge of complexity*. Harlow, England: Prentis Hall.
- Streatfield, P. J. (2001). *The paradox of control in organisations*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Tuan, N. T., & Ryan, T. (2000). Toward a humanized systemic organization: A confusian perspective. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 341-348.
- Unknown. (2008, September 27). Acts 2. Retrieved September 27, 2008, from Bible.org: <http://net.bible.org/bible>
- Williams, M. (n.d.). *Disentangling concepts: The role of affect in trust development and cooperation*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.
- Winston, B. (2002). *Be a leader for God's sake*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University.
- Yost, L., & Tracy, H. (1997). A process to guide decisionmaking for development activities in language programs. *Notes on Anthropology and Intercultural Community Work*, 1-17.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organization*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.